Intelligently using data from external WSNs

Gabriel Martins Dias, Simon Oechsner and Boris Bellalta

Department of Information and Communication Technologies
Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain
Email: {gabriel.martins, simon.oechsner, boris.bellalta}@upf.edu

arXiv:1407.0981v1 [cs.NI] 3 Jul 2014

***Abstract*—In this work, we build on the concept of inter-Wireless Sensor Networks (WSNs) information exchange. We show the feasibility of an approach that intelligently utilizes information produced by other WSNs that may or not belong to the same administrative domain. To illustrate how the behavior of a WSN can be optimized using data from external WSNs, a specific use-case is considered, where the operation of a WSN measuring relative humidity is optimized using the data obtained from a WSN measuring temperature. Evaluated using a dedicated performance score, the simulation results show that this new approach can find a trade-off between energy consumption and quality of measurements. Moreover, we outline the additional challenges that need to be overcome, and draw conclusions to guide the future work in this field.**

I. Introduction

Nowadays, forests, cities and houses, among others, are monitored by multiple Wireless Sensor Networks (WSNs) that may belong to different organizations, both public and private, as well as to individual citizens. In addition, there is a high heterogeneity regarding the technologies, protocols and standards used in WSNs. In this situation, each WSN usually operates completely independent of other WSNs, even if they are covering the same physical area, and is thus not able to take any advantage of the presence of those other WSNs to enrich its collected data nor to optimize its operation.

However, WSN performance can be improved by combining data generated from different sensors, belonging to the same node, other nodes from the same network or from other WSNs. This data sharing allows each WSN to build a deeper knowledge about its surroundings, may reduce the probability of getting wrong values and taking wrong decisions, and encompasses wider areas and different perspectives of the same environment.

In an era of high availability of data from the cloud, we are interested in using data from other WSNs to reduce the energy consumption and improve the quality of the measurements done by a target WSN. The external information will be used to change the operation of the nodes and save energy when the environmental conditions do not indicate that big changes will happen in the near future. For example, relative humidity and temperature values usually have a high correlation, and the former may have a higher variation if the latter is changing.

This paper lists some of the existing alternatives for collaboration in WSNs, and develops further the inter-WSNs information exchange concept introduced in [1] and in [2]. The main idea behind the inter-WSN information exchange is that the data gathered by other WSNs can be exchanged via their sinks and used to improve the operation of the target one, and vice versa. In order to validate the concept, we first discuss potential scenarios, then list the open challenges for such an approach, define a way to scale the quality of the measurements and the WSNs' performance, and finally present some simulation results from a chosen scenario consisting of two WSNs, one for monitoring the relative humidity and one for the temperature. Based on the presented results, we show the feasibility of this kind of collaboration and measure how energy-efficient and accurate it can be.

The paper is organized in the following sections: In Section II, we briefly summarize how the collaboration in WSNs is currently done; Section III presents scenarios where external data available from other WSNs may be useful in the management of a local WSN; Section IV describes some of the challenges that should be solved in this area; our simulation scenario and setup as well as its results are explained in Section V; and, at the end, our conclusions and ideas for future work are shown in Section VII.

II. Collaboration in WSNs

According to the synergy theory [3], a system that combines the action of individual components may produce better results than the individual components acting separately. Based on that principle, several collaboration mechanisms in WSNs have been developed.

In those works, the information exchange in WSNs described can be categorized to happen on three different scales: (A) **Inside wireless sensor nodes** that are equipped with two or more sensor types, and build deeper knowledge based on the different data types; (B) **Inside WSNs** that enable the communication between their nodes, which share knowledge and resources in order to achieve common goals; and (C) **Exporting the knowledge built in a WSN** to other systems that can use the data for their own purpose.

A. Intra-node collaboration

Wireless sensor nodes can be equipped with different sensors that are able to measure environmental parameters, such as temperature, relative humidity and luminosity levels. Additionally, other types of information can be extracted from their components, for example, the battery voltage. The combination of these parameters can be done by WSN applications that are able to analyze the data in order to take decisions based only on local information. For example, [4] describes an application that detects fire and enables nodes to match information from the CO, temperature, ionization and photoelectric sensors in order to infer whether a fire is present or not.

B. Inter-node collaboration

As briefly described before, by making use of the radio communication, it is possible to exchange information between nodes and take decisions based on the combined information. This information, which usually represents a more complete and more reliable knowledge about the external world, may substitute new measurements, reduce the energy consumption of the nodes and, consequently, increase the WSNs' lifetime. Moreover, even though the use of the intra-node collaboration may enhance the WSNs' performance when combined with inter-node collaboration, the latter–done at the intra-WSN level–is enough by itself to improve several aspects of the WSNs:

1) Self-organization: WSNs may change their topology and find new routing paths based on node constraints. The Constrained Anisotropic Diffusion Routing protocol is described in [5] as a routing protocol that determines the optimal path by making transmissions through the nodes that are retrieving the most relevant measurements for the WSN at the given time.

Similarly, a mechanism that creates an autonomous cluster-based architecture with group managers that lead sets of nodes is presented in [6]. Those managers are chosen according to the amount of energy available and they are responsible for setting the group topology and deciding which nodes are going to sense data in the next time interval. This decision is based on the nodes' location and on their energy level.

Another example is the Biologically-Inspired Architecture for WSNs, which is presented in [7] as an option that balances the work load by adjusting nodes' sleeping times and the network's response times according to the delay tolerated by the application requirements, and by collecting and combining data from different types of sensors instead of making more measurements.

2) Resource sharing: WSNs are often composed by wireless sensor nodes with different abilities, which means having different sensor types, different amount of memory available or different types of hardware components, and therefore nodes with higher computational power than others. Based on the idea that the whole is more than the sum of its parts, resource sharing techniques are used to take advantage of the nodes' heterogeneity by selecting which of them are going to process certain tasks. As a result, WSNs' capabilities are better utilized and, because of the use of the best nodes for each task, the overall performance is improved as well as the quality of the obtained results.

For example, the mechanism proposed in [8] provides a dynamic task-assignment solution that enables nodes to collaboratively process sensing, timing and functional tasks. In short, it explores star-architectures with one node taking responsibility for the centralized execution of certain tasks, based on the information received from its neighbors. In contrast, the approaches presented in [9] and [10] are focused on WSNs that must run more than one application at the same time. However, in these networks the nodes are not able to perform multiple tasks or store all the applications in their memory at the same time, due to their resource constraints. Thus, both approaches are meant to maximize the overall quality of the measurements by selecting the best combination of sensor nodes for the available applications according to their resources.

3) Cooperation: Given the goal of the WSN application, the fusion of the data sensed by the nodes may represent higher data quality, reflecting their reliability and the network's coverage. In [5], the mechanism called Information-Driven Sensor Querying is presented as an option that enables intra-WSN cooperation by querying data from a subset of nodes based on their localization and coverage, and using a *belief value* in order to exclude measurements without interest (e.g., messages from nodes that are too far from the point of interest). Alternatively, in [11], an algorithm to combine data collected by a specific set of nodes is presented. Assuming that the network has two types of nodes, nodes equipped with high consumption sensors and nodes equipped with low consumption sensors, the nodes with sensors that consume more energy but are able to produce more detailed and less erroneous information about the environment remain in sleeping mode, until they are activated by the detection of a possible object of interest by the nodes with low consumption sensors. Another solution is described in [12] as a way to select which nodes may be activated for a task, considering that an area must be covered by, at least, a defined number of them.

Finally, the Round Robin Cycle for Predictions in WSNs is described in [13]. This algorithm was developed for WSN applications that require a continuous delivery of sensor measurements, such as temperature or traffic monitoring. In order to build sets of nodes that provide trusted measurements, it considers that a sensor measurement is predictable if the predicted value (on average) differs less than a defined threshold from the actual one when using other nodes' measurements. This approach can be extended and adapted for the use of external data to make predictions while keeping the quality of the measurements, which would be enough for networks that use continuous monitoring applications.

C. Collaboration with external systems

Resource sharing is also possible between different WSNs. An inter-domain routing protocol is described in [14], where it is shown that the gateways may share information about their nodes and take advantage of being physically close to each other. This information can be used to transmit packets through nodes from a different WSN, which can be done either to share the information or for routing purposes. Even though the idea of our work is to create a link between nodes from different WSNs, it is neither meant to share resources nor information between wireless sensor nodes, but the knowledge that the gateways are able to produce based on collected data.

In [15], the authors describe a scenario where a system is responsible for building a richer knowledge about the environment by making use of the information produced by other WSNs. In their example, wireless sensor nodes combine sensory information with their localization and help other systems to localize and track objects from a distance. The goal of the described approach is to enable a robot to use the data retrieved by a WSN that detects the presence of objects inside the monitored area. After receiving the information from the WSN, the robot interprets the position of the object and moves itself to its location in order to get more details

Sender WSNs	Information sent	Receiver WSNs	Correlation
Temperature and relative humidity monitoring	Temperature and relative humidity values	Fire detection	Warm and dry times are more likely to have fires.
Temperature monitoring	Temperature values	Snowfall detection	Snowfall may happen only during cold times.
Temperature monitoring and rainfall detection	Temperature values and presence of rain	Snowfall detection	Changes in the environment may lead to landslides and avalanches.
		Flood detection	Changes in the environment may change the water quality and river flooding.
Rainfall detection	Presence of rain	Water quality monitoring	During rain, the water quality is more likely to change.
		Traffic monitoring	During rain, the traffic load and the probability of car accidents may increase.
Traffic monitoring	Local traffic jams	Pollution monitoring	Pollution levels may increase when traffic jams occur.
Disaster monitoring	Phenomenon detection	Structural health monitoring	Natural disasters may change buildings' structural health.

TABLE I: Examples of scenarios that may take advantage from inter-WSN information exchange.

about the real situation. In this case, the presented approach is different from ours because it uses a non-generic solution that is highly coupled to the presented scenario without a WSN as the beneficiary of the collected information.

In contrast to the described works, we extend the concept of collaboration to an upper layer and build the information exchange between WSNs that belong to the same or different administrative domains, without losing the collaboration from the other levels. This collaboration, which has not been considered by other authors up to this moment, may improve even more the WSNs' performance by increasing the WSNs' lifetime, their accuracy, their reliability and the relevance of the acquired knowledge.

III. Potential Scenarios

In the real world, many WSNs with different goals may be deployed in the same area and sense data that is, actually, semantically linked. Temperature, relative humidity and wind speed are examples of measured values that may be correlated in places like open fields, mountains, forests, roads and buildings. Table I lists a variety of scenarios where WSNs could take advantage of using the external information available. Below, we describe them, with emphasis on the fire detection scenario.

A. Fire detection

Fire detection may involve a complex combination of different environmental aspects that may change according to the surroundings monitored: in contrast to fires inside buildings, forest fires are usually influenced by wind and rain levels as well as other ambient parameters. Therefore, in order to cover these different environments, there are different ways of detecting fire using WSNs. However, most of them use a fusion of the sensed data, such as temperature, wind speed, humidity and CO_2 levels, as well as rain detection.

Some indices, for example, the Canadian Forest Fire Weather Index (FWI) System [16] and the American Fire Danger Rating System [17], were developed in order to measure the fire risks, potential danger, type of fire, total amount of effort needed to extinguish the fires, etc. Moreover, FWI provides a mapping between environmental observations and fire behavior that estimates the probability of having fire according to weather observations, such as temperature, humidity, rain and wind speed. Also, it has two indices to classify the fire behavior, and three different fuel codes that classify fuel moisture content and relative fire behavior according to past and present observations of the weather on forest floor fuels. In other words, many relations between fire and external parameters are already known and documented by these indices, but they are rarely used by other systems, such as WSNs.

B. Other scenarios

Besides the scenario described above, there is a high number of WSNs combinations that are usually placed nearby. For example, the pollution levels in the cities may be related to the climate conditions and to the number of vehicles on the streets. Thus, systems that monitor pollution can predict events in their measurements if there is a traffic load variation or climate changes. Furthermore, traffic jams could be identified and pollution sensors should have their operation changed in order to provide more detailed measurements in these places during those periods of time.

Another example in a metropolitan environment are intelligent transportation systems, which can make use of information exchange. For example, during rain, the vehicle traffic load may increase, as well as the probability of car accidents. Intelligent transportation systems that control traffic can benefit from this knowledge by increasing the number of active nodes, or by reducing the interval between two report transmissions during critical situations in order to produce more precise information.

Rural areas also have potential use cases in which inter-WSN information exchange can be applied. For example, information about temperature and rain might be useful for WSNs that are monitoring rivers and their water quality, or snow levels. These phenomena can represent changes in the environment as a whole and might increase the chances of predicting landslides, avalanches, variations in the water quality or river flooding. As a reaction, WSNs that monitor snow levels and the water quality level would change their workload according to the predictions.

Finally, structural health monitoring networks, which are usually used both in cities and rural areas, could benefit from receiving information about climate changes and other phenomena (for example, earthquakes and volcanic activities),



Fig. 1: Chosen scenario

and adapt the interval between two measurements or the number of active nodes at a given time.

IV. Challenges

As this work follows a new paradigm with the collaboration between WSNs, it presents new challenges other than those faced by the current solutions, regarding the sources of the data, the type of results and the goals of the collaboration.

A. Joining WSNs that were not necessarily built to work together

Working with information from external (and possibly unknown) sources requires some caution because: (1) the local WSN does not have any knowledge about how reliable the external information is; (2) the external information may refer to a different area other than the one monitored by the local WSN, which reduces its relevance to the local system; (3) external WSNs have their own schedule for transmitting their data and it is not possible to change or predict this schedule from outside; (4) the data may be represented in different types and parameters, for example, it may have different quality levels, such as a summary of the measurements done in the past few hours by several nodes or a fresh measurement done by one wireless sensor node.

Therefore, some extra effort is needed to check whether the data describes real, relevant and up-to-date situations, and this implies filtering wrong data before taking any internal action. In other words, the operation must not depend on the quantity of external data, but it might be enhanced when relevant information is available.

B. Predicting events instead of detecting them

It is easier to measure the current status of the environment than concluding what is going to happen next. The proposed system will not be responsible for detecting events, but it should work with the probability of them occurring in the future. Moreover, real scenarios are under the influence of different factors that may happen regularly (for example, higher temperatures during the summer) or be sporadic, such as forest fires that, consequently, increase the local temperatures. Therefore, not only the correlation between different data types must be verified, but also the causes of the events of interest should be detected.

C. Increasing the WSNs' lifetime

Randomly turning off nodes to save energy is a naive solution that may result in missing relevant information about the environment. Instead, the system must measure how relevant the data provided by each node is, and use that information to choose the nodes that will be turned off to operate the WSN correctly when saving energy. This involves attending minimal requirements, such as covering certain areas and having a minimum number of measurements per area. Besides measuring and keeping the quality of the measurements, updates in the WSN operation must be applied at the right time in order to optimally react to the predicted situations.

Differently from the other challenges, this one also exists in the intra-network collaboration (described in Section II), and existing solutions there may help to solve this issue.

V. Use Case

To base the simulations on realistic data, we used the temperature and relative humidity of 16 days measured by three different nodes in the experiments done in [13]. We considered each measurement done by the real nodes as the average of the network measurements in our simulations. Moreover, each set of measurements done by a node in a day was considered one day's worth of data. Therefore, we had enough data to simulate 48 different days.

A. Scenario

For the simulations, we implemented the architecture described in [1] with two WSNs interconnected through their respective Enhanced Gateways (EGs). The simulated scenario is based on a real scenario from where the data was fetched: an office with two WSNs deployed close to each other as shown in Figure 1. There, nodes were positioned in a grid topology with two different WSNs monitoring temperature and relative humidity.

As it is shown, *Network A* has one node that retrieves data from the environment, and a sink node that receives the temperature values and transmits them to the respective EG (EG_A), which forwards everything to EG_B. On the other hand, *Network B* was composed by 26 nodes that monitor the relative humidity plus a sink connected to EG_B, which is responsible for averaging the values received after each measurement. Based on the data received from EG_A and on the stored averages, EG_B is able to set different WSN operation plans, and to communicate the required changes to its sink node in order to forward them to the wireless sensor nodes. Figure 2 describes the possible states of a WSN.

B. System goal

At runtime, *Network B* defines how its nodes will react to environmental changes based on the predictions done: reporting more information when the environment is supposed to undergo variations and saving energy otherwise.

In order to predict these variations, we calculated the average of the temperature and relative humidity values, without mixing data types, in discrete and sequential 5-minute window intervals. The absolute difference between the averages of two consecutive intervals is denoted Δ. In order to identify the



(a) Nodes report measured values to the sink.

(b) The sink transmits to the EG the sampled data, which can be forwarded to other EGs at the same time as they transmit to this WSN.

(c) EG computes a new plan for the nodes and transmits the new configuration to its sink.

(d) The sink updates the nodes' configuration.

Fig. 2: Different states of a WSNs using inter-WSN information exchange

data types, we used subscripts: Δ_{T} for temperature values and Δ_{RH} for relative humidity values.

We have assumed that a large difference between the averages represent significant changes in the environment. Therefore, the system goal is to predict whether the next Δ will be over a determined threshold, τ, or not. In case of $\Delta > \tau$, we label it as *high*Δ; Otherwise, we call it a *low*Δ. The value of τ is set based on the proportion of Δs seen in the historical data. For example, if the goal is to predict the highest quarter of Δs in a day, the threshold will be set at the 75th percentile of Δs. In this case, we identify it with the number 75 subscripted: τ_{75}.

As an example, Figure 3 shows the measurements of the temperature and relative humidity sensors done during a day, and the blue background represents the intervals with *high*Δ_{RH}s, considering τ_{70}. During these intervals, the *Network B* should have activated a plan to report more data and produced more detailed information, since significant changes in the environment are generally more interesting and critical to report.



Fig. 3: Values observed during a day.

In some cases, it may be useful to know if a *high*Δ means that the average is increasing or decreasing. In order to identify it, we added an additional notation to Δ. If the most recent average computed differs more than τ and is greater than the penultimate one, we mark it as *high*Δ^{+}; if it differs more than τ but is lower, we use *high*Δ^{-}, as shown in Figure 4.

C. Symptoms

To make predictions, we must observe the measurements and find symptoms. A symptom, σ, is defined as a value where a $\Delta > \sigma$ represents a high probability of having $\Delta > \tau$ in the next interval. Therefore, if we notice that the most recent Δ is greater than σ, we have a symptom of *high*Δ; otherwise, it is a symptom of *low*Δ.

Even though the concepts of σ and τ are similar, the numerical values may be different. For example, after observing the historical data, we might notice that every $\Delta > \tau_{40}$ calculated at time t was followed by a $\Delta > \tau_{75}$ at time $t+1$. So, we would set the value of σ at the 40th percentile of Δs.

D. Predictions

Periodically, the data retrieved by the nodes is transmitted to the sink. After receiving all the measurements, the sink calculates the average of the received values before reporting it to the EG, which may forward it to external WSNs. In parallel, the EG may also receive information from external WSNs and, up to this point, all the data is collected and stored for further analysis. In intervals, the EG uses the collected data to predict if there will be changes in the near future. For example, in our tests, it calculates the Δ_{T} and the Δ_{RH}, as explained above.

Predictions are independent for each metric. Furthermore, any prediction is composed by three factors: the last two symptoms and the last prediction. The general idea is to try to learn the trend and avoid wrong predictions provoked by noise and outliers. Thus, every time that two factors agree in one direction, the prediction is that, in the next interval, the environment will follow it. Otherwise, if the three factors are different, the prediction is that the environment will not undergo variations in the near future. Table II shows how we did the predictions using Δs.

Last Symptoms		Last Prediction	Prediction
lowΔ	*low*Δ	any	*low*Δ
highΔ^{+}	*high*Δ^{+}	any	*high*Δ^{+}
highΔ^{-}	*high*Δ^{-}	any	*high*Δ^{-}
highΔ^{+}	any	*high*Δ^{+}	*high*Δ^{+}
highΔ^{-}	any	*high*Δ^{-}	*high*Δ^{-}
lowΔ	any	*low*Δ	*low*Δ
highΔ^{+}	*high*Δ^{-}	*low*Δ	*low*Δ
highΔ^{+}	*low*Δ	*high*Δ^{-}	*low*Δ
highΔ^{-}	*low*Δ	*high*Δ^{+}	*low*Δ

TABLE II: How the system reacts to the symptoms.



(a) The concept of *low*Δ (b) *low*Δ (c) The concept of *high*Δ$^+$ (d) The concept of *high*Δ$^-$

Fig. 4: How the system labels the Δs.

E. Approaches

If a *EG* receives information from internal and external sources, each prediction may be based on a different data type. In this case, it combines them in the simplest way: if one of the predictions is labeled as *high*Δ, the final prediction is a *high*Δ; Otherwise, it is a *low*Δ. Based on this result, the EG selects the new plan to be applied by the sink. At the end, the sink transmits to its nodes a new configuration that they must follow in the next time interval, which may be an instruction to (de)activate themselves or to change the sensing intervals:

1) Changing the number of active nodes: This approach reduces the energy consumption of the network by deactivating some nodes during a certain period of time. In other words, when a node is deactivated, it does not make any measurement, but it may forward messages exchanged by their neighbors. Thus, we created three different sets of active nodes for the *Network B*: One with half of the nodes plus the sink; another with the other half plus the sink; and the last one with all nodes together. The first two plans are used for saving energy and are switched on every update to extend the WSN's lifetime, while the goal of the all-nodes plan is to provide more information about the environment. The downside is that this plan consumes more energy. Therefore, the latter is only used when *high*Δs are predicted and the environment is expected to change.

2) Changing the sensing intervals: Differently from the other approach, this solution does not change the number of active nodes. However, when the prediction is a *high*Δ and changes are expected in *Network B*, nodes take measurements and transmit them every 30 seconds, consuming more energy and producing more information about the environment. Otherwise, this is done every 180 seconds.

F. Quality of Measurements (QoM)

As explained before, one of the goals of this work is to show that it is possible to reduce the energy consumed in a WSN without reducing the QoM (i.e., a parameter that evaluates if the gathered information from the environment during a certain period is enough to accurately represent it). However, the level of the QoM depends on the type of information reported by the nodes.

For example, in our case, the WSNs make continuous transmissions to the sink and tolerate a small number of packet losses as well as delays between consecutive transmissions, but do not allow the reduction of the covered area because it might miss changes occurring in certain subareas. Therefore, we scaled the QoM as shown in Table III. There, each interval with a *high*Δ should be covered by more reports, increasing the level of knowledge about the environment. Although a high number of measurements always represents a *good* QoM, the intervals with a *low*Δ can be covered by less reports without compromising the quality, thereby saving energy. Periods with a *low*Δ that are wrongly predicted mean that the system expected to have a *high*Δ in them, produced more measurements and, thus, wasted energy. Differently from the states with a *high*Δ and low number of measurements, those periods still have a *good* QoM, but the energy consumption might have been reduced and the WSN's lifetime increased.

Based on this, the accuracy was defined as the percentage of intervals in a day in which the system was operating in a highlighted state. Moreover, the accuracy of *high*Δs is the percentage of intervals with *high*Δs covered by a high number of measurements.

		# of measurements	
		High	Low
Δ	*high*	GOOD	BAD
	low	GOOD	GOOD

TABLE III: Definition of QoM for this scenario.

Regarding the system operation in the simulation, during intervals in which variations are predicted and *high*Δ$_{\text{RH}}$s are expected, *Network B* updates its operation in order to collect more information. Each update on its operation affects either the number of active nodes or the time interval between two measurements done by the sensors. As a consequence of this, the number of measurements, the number of transmissions and the energy consumption have higher values during these periods of time, while the opposite effect occurs when no variation is predicted.

G. Performance score

In order to evaluate how efficient the use of external information can be, we developed a way to compare the approaches. For each scenario, we measure the lowest energy consumption that the WSN may have (E_{min}), which can be done by always setting the plan that produces less measurements during a day. On the other hand, we measure how much energy is consumed by the WSN if it produces the maximum number of measurements during the same time interval (E_{max}). Thus, the percentage of energy saved by an approach (E_{ps}) is derived from the energy consumed (E_{consumed}) by the relation:

$$E_{\text{ps}} = \frac{E_{\text{max}} - E_{\text{consumed}}}{E_{\text{max}} - E_{\text{min}}}$$

Figure 5a shows how much energy can be saved based on the thresholds that are used as symptoms of future changes. For example, at the point $(40, 20)$, any Δ_{RH} at the 40^{th} percentile is considered as a symptom of change, as well as any Δ_{T} at the 20^{th} percentile. When a symptom is detected, the EG may launch a plan to produce more measurements in the next time-interval and, consequently, consume more energy.

Figure 5b shows the total accuracy of the predictions. A good prediction done during a *low*Δ means that the system is producing less measurements and saving energy. Therefore, this accuracy factor is implicitly inserted in the value of E_{ps} and should not be considered again in the final equation. Considering this, the trade-off between the QoM and the energy consumption can be calculated if we use only the percentage of predictions of *high*Δs ($P_{high\Delta}$) that the system could successfully do:

$$P_{high\Delta} = \frac{\text{\# of } high\Delta\text{s correctly predicted}}{\text{\# of } high\Delta\text{s}}$$

Figure 5c shows how the accuracy of *high*Δs changes depending on the threshold chosen to represent a symptom of changes in the future.

Finally, the *Performance score* (p) is defined as the product between the percentage of saved energy and the percentage of good predictions done at *high* levels, which quantifies how much the system actually consumes to have such level of accuracy. If interpreted as a dot product between two vectors, the highest value represents the system having the highest possible energy savings and the highest possible accuracy *high*Δs:

$$p_{(\alpha,\beta)} = {E_{\text{ps}}}^{\alpha} \cdot {P_{high\Delta}}^{\beta},$$

where α and β are the exponents that represent the system's priority on one parameter over the other. Thus $\alpha + \beta = 1$, $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\beta \geq 0$. For example, if $\alpha \leq \beta$, the energy savings will have a bigger impact at the performance score. Obviously, if $\alpha = \beta$, the system will not prioritize any of them. We will use this setting as our default performance evaluation metric in the following.



(a) Energy saved (E_{ps}) (b) Accuracy of the predictions

(c) Accuracy of *high*Δs ($P_{high\Delta}$) (d) $p_{(0.5,0.5)}$

Fig. 5: Parameters obtained using the training data.

VI. Evaluation

To check the feasibility of using this kind of solution in the presented scenario, we evaluated the energy consumption and the WSN's accuracy in OMNeT++ [18] and Matlab.

First, we simulated the energy consumption based on TelosB nodes [19] using BMAC [20] as MAC protocol and a flooding routing protocol. Using OMNeT++ and MiXiM [21], we obtained the energy consumed by the sensor nodes according to the time interval between two measurements and the number of active nodes, as explained in Section V-E. Moreover, in these simulations, the sensor nodes received updates from the EG every 5 minutes. Based on the total energy consumed, we calculated the average energy consumption for each type of plan applied to the nodes, including the energy spent to disseminate the updates through the network.

In Matlab, the data from the sensors were split into a training and a validation datasets to avoid overfitting. Each of these datasets was defined by a set of 24 days that were randomly selected on each run (repeated random subsampling validation). The model was fit to the training data, and predictive accuracy was assessed using the validation data. The tests were done over 10 different combinations of days and the final results were averaged over the splits. In the end, we checked how the system behaved when the plan of *Network B* was selected using only internal information (relative humidity values), only external information (temperature values) and combining both, and used the energy consumption levels to plot the results.

A. Training dataset

After selecting 24 days for the training dataset, the measured values were used to set three different parameters:

1) The value of τ: This was the threshold that the EGs must set. It was calculated as explained in V-B, based on the measurements done during the training days.

2) The values of σs: The system built a table with the values of p based on percentiles, as shown in Figure 5d. The numerical value of σ_{T} and σ_{RH} was the same as the percentiles of Δ_{T} and Δ_{RH} with the highest value of p.

B. Validating dataset

The other 24 days were considered part of the validating dataset and their data was used to validate whether the system had chosen well and whether our hypothesis was valid. For this, the system used all the parameters calculated in the last step to calculate p.

C. Results

To show better the benefits of the developed solution, we represent the collected results together with two baseline scenarios that did not use collaboration. In the first scenario, the nodes always produced less measurements and the opposite in the other one. Thus, by using them, we can show the lowest and the highest energy consumption values possible. An important remark is that these two scenarios always have $p = 0$, since either they did not save any energy (the highest consumption plan case) or their accuracy of detecting *high*Δs was zero (the lowest consumption plan case). Therefore, these plans can be considered as references and give some idea about how much our solution was able to exploit the trade-off between the two extremes.

The plots in Figure 6 show the obtained results, which are split into three groups, according to the τ set for each case (τ_{70}, τ_{60} and τ_{50}). Each bar represents an average for the 24 days of the validation dataset. Observing the data, we can see that the correlation between temperature and relative humidity values is closer to -1 when we consider only the highest Δs. So, we assume that there are other factors that may influence the small variations in the relative humidity. This explains why the percentage of *high*Δs correctly predicted is lower when the system tries to track a higher number of changes (τ_{50}).

In Figures 6a and 6b, we can observe that, when we used the plan that changed the number of active nodes, the system spent around 54% of the energy compared to the scenario in which the network was always producing more measurements. Also, Figure 6c shows that predictions can successfully improve the WSNs' operation. It is possible to see that, using only the relative humidity values as a reference (absence of external collaboration), 42.3% of the 5-minute intervals with *high*Δ_{RH}s were correctly predicted with τ_{60}. Compared to that, we can observe that the energy consumption increased much less than the accuracy levels. For example, with τ_{60}, using the combination of internal and external information, the system was able to correctly predict 67.9% more *high*Δs consuming only 33.5% more energy. This means that the energy was used more intelligently in the second case.

Figure 6d shows that our approach for inter-WSN information exchange outperforms the other types of collaboration that use less information and spend their energy less efficiently. In summary, the trade-off between energy consumption and QoM was achieved and found to produce more effective results than the other approaches.

VII. Conclusion and Future Work

Based on the presented results, it is possible to determine that external information can be used to optimize the WSNs' performance, which is illustrated by the difference in the values of p. During the tests, we have also noticed that these improvements could be achieved only with data that is not only highly correlated, but there must also be a relation of causation between them. In this case, we noticed that changes in temperature led to changes in relative humidity, but the opposite was not necessarily true. Therefore, it would be more complex to make good predictions if we tried to predict temperature changes based on relative humidity values.

Although we made use of real data from existing experiments, we did generic calculations and assumptions that can be extended to numerous scenarios, in order to prove the general idea of this concept. We expect that specific knowledge about different scenarios may lead to better results. For example, as shown in [22], when the relative humidity is over 50%, it is possible to calculate its value based on information about the temperature only. Thus, in a scenario similar to ours, the system could save even more energy by letting the EG calculate the local data based on external information.

For the future work, the use of data mining tasks to systematically include different types of data at runtime should be considered. This will reduce the manual calculations and make the solution scalable. Additionally, using mathematical foundation, we are planning to construct an analytical model to show whether a solution is feasible or not, based on historical data only. Moreover, more simulations involving alternative scenarios and different WSN types will be done, since they have different requirements and, therefore, must use different plans to react to the changes. Finally, as described in [2], the solution should be adapted to an autonomic system, being able to be pro-active and self-managing, to improve the information fusion and the decision optimization, and to create specific plans for the WSNs according to the predictions about the near future.

Acknowledgment

This work has been partially supported by the Spanish Government, through the projects TEC2012-32354 (Plan Nacional I+D), CSD2008-00010 (Consolider-Ingenio Program) and by the Catalan Government (SGR2009#00617).

References

[1] Sougata Pal, Simon Oechsner, Boris Bellalta, and Miquel Oliver. Performance optimization of multiple interconnected heterogeneous sensor networks via collaborative information sharing. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Smart Environments*, 5(4):403–413, March 2013.

[2] Gabriel Martins Dias. Performance optimization of wsns using external information. In *World of Wireless, Mobile and Multimedia Networks (WoWMoM), 2013 IEEE 14th International Symposium and Workshops on a*, pages 1–2, 2013.

[3] Hermann Haken. Synergetics. *Naturwissenschaften*, 67(3):121–128, March 1980.

[4] Mohamed Hefeeda and Majid Bagheri. Forest fire modeling and early detection using wireless sensor networks. *Ad Hoc & Sensor Wireless Networks*, 7(August 2003):169–224, 2009.



(a) Changing the time interval between two measurements.

(b) Changing the number of active nodes.

(c) Accuracy of the predictions of *high*Δs.

(d) Performance score of each approach.

Fig. 6: Simulation results.

[5] Maurice Chu and Horst Haussecker. Scalable Information-Driven Sensor Querying and Routing for Ad Hoc Heterogeneous Sensor Networks. *International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications*, 16(3):293–313, August 2002.

[6] Trang Minh, Boris Bellalta, and Miquel Oliver. DISON: A Self-organizing Network Management Framework for Wireless Sensor Networks. *Ad Hoc Networks*, 111, 2013.

[7] Pruet Boonma and Junichi Suzuki. Bisnet: A biologically-inspired middleware architecture for self-managing wireless sensor networks. *Comput. Netw.*, 51(16):4599–4616, November 2007.

[8] Giancarlo Fortino, Antonio Guerrieri, Fabio Luigi Bellifemine, and Roberta Giannantonio. Platform-independent development of collaborative wireless body sensor network applications: SPINE2. In *2009 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, number October, pages 3144–3150. IEEE, October 2009.

[9] Dong Guo and Xiaodong Wang. Dynamic Sensor Collaboration Via Sequential Monte Carlo. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 22(6):1037–1047, August 2004.

[10] You Xu, Abusayeed Saifullah, Yixin Chen, Chenyang Lu, and Sangeeta Bhattacharya. Near optimal multi-application allocation in shared sensor networks. In *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM international symposium on Mobile ad hoc networking and computing - MobiHoc '10*, page 181, New York, New York, USA, 2010. ACM Press.

[11] Rui Tan, Guoliang Xing, Xue Liu, Jianguo Yao, and Zhaohui Yuan. Adaptive calibration for fusion-based cyber-physical systems. *ACM Trans. Embed. Comput. Syst.*, 11(4):80:1–80:25, January 2013.

[12] Chi-Fu Huang and Yu-Chee Tseng. The coverage problem in a wireless sensor network. *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM international conference on Wireless sensor networks and applications - WSNA '03*, page 115, 2003.

[13] Le Borgne Yann-Ael and Gianluca Bontempi. Round Robin Cycle for Predictions in Wireless Sensor Networks. In *2005 International Conference on Intelligent Sensors, Sensor Networks and Information Processing*, pages 253–258. IEEE, 2005.

[14] Falko Dressler, Abdalkarim Awad, and Mario Gerla. Inter-Domain Routing and Data Replication in Virtual Coordinate Based Networks. In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Communications*, pages 1–5. IEEE, May 2010.

[15] Lynne E. Parker. Detecting and monitoring time-related abnormal events using a wireless sensor network and mobile robot. In *2008 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pages 3292–3298. IEEE, September 2008.

[16] William J De Groot. Interpreting the Canadian Forest Fire Weather Index (FWI) System. *Fourth Central Regional Fire Weather Committee Scientific and Technical Seminar*, Proceeding:3–14, 1987.

[17] George M. Keetch, John J.; Byram. A Drought Index for Forest Fire Control. Technical report, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Asheville, North Carolina, February 1968.

[18] András Varga. The OMNeT++ discrete event simulation system. *Proceedings of the European Simulation Multiconference (ESM2001)*, 9, 2001.

[19] Inc . Crossbow Technology. TelosB Mote Platform. Rev B.

[20] Khalil Fakih, Jean-Francois Diouris, and Guillaume Andrieux. BMAC: Beamformed MAC protocol with channel tracker in MANET using smart antennas. In *2006 European Conference on Wireless Technologies*, volume 2, pages 185–188. IEEE, September 2006.

[21] A Köpke, M Swigulski, K Wessel, D Willkomm, T E V Parker, P T Kleinhaneveld, T E V Parker, O W Visser, H S Lichte, and S Valentin. Simulating Wireless and Mobile Networks in OMNeT ++ The MiXiM Vision.

[22] Mark G. Lawrence. The Relationship between Relative Humidity and the Dewpoint Temperature in Moist Air: A Simple Conversion and Applications. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 86(2):225–233, February 2005.